

### Amendments to the Claims:

This listing of claims will replace all prior versions, and listings of claims in the application. Applicants have submitted a new complete claim set showing any marked up claims with insertions indicated by underlining and deletions indicated by strikeouts and/or double bracketing.

#### Listing of Claims:

1. (Currently Amended) A method of displaying a web page at a client device, comprising:

detecting an object associated with the web page at the client device, wherein the object does not include a downloadable security profile, generated by an external content inspection engine, attached thereto;

assessing at the client device, as part of displaying the web page, which of plural trust levels is to be accorded to the object without using the downloadable security profile, or generating the downloadable security profile at the client device; and

suppressing the object based on the accorded trust level,

wherein assessing which of the plural trust levels is to be accorded to the object evaluates criteria, as part of displaying the web page, based on a content, source, or action of the object and wherein the assessing is performed on the client device on which the web page is displayed .

2. (Original) A method according to Claim 1, wherein the object is one of a COM object or an ActiveX control.

Type of Response: Amendment  
Application Number: 10/780,144  
Attorney Docket Number: 307917.01  
Filing Date: 17 February 2004

3. (Original) A method according to Claim 1, wherein the object is embedded in the web page, and includes any one of downloadable code, a link to a URL, a popup window, graphic data, a video file, an audio file, and a text file.

4. (Original) A method according to Claim 1, wherein the object is a link to an object on a remote server, wherein further the object on the remote server includes any one of downloadable code, a URL, a popup window, graphic data, a video file, an audio file, and a text file.

5. (Previously Presented) A method according to Claim 1, wherein assessing which of plural trust levels is to be accorded to the object includes evaluating criteria comprising whether the object is from a trusted source, whether the object upgrades an existing object, and whether a download flag is set, and

wherein further suppressing the object includes displaying a prompt to indicate the suppression of the object based upon a positive evaluation of any of the criteria.

6. (Original) A method according to Claim 5, wherein the prompt is a modal prompt to provide a user with an activation choice.

7. (Previously Presented) A method according to Claim 5, wherein the prompt is a modeless prompt to advise a user of the object being suppressed and ~~providing~~ wherein the modeless prompt provides a description of the object being suppressed.

Type of Response: Amendment  
Application Number: 10/780,144  
Attorney Docket Number: 307917.01  
Filing Date: 17 February 2004

8. (Previously Presented) A method according to Claim 5, wherein the prompt is a modeless prompt to advise a user of the object being suppressed and to provide the user with a subsequent activation choice.

9. (Original) A method according to Claim 1,  
wherein assessing which of the plural trust levels is to be accorded to the object evaluates criteria including whether the object is to be rendered and whether a download flag is set, and

wherein further suppressing the object includes displaying a prompt to indicate the suppression of the object based upon a positive evaluation of any of the criteria.

10. (Original) A method according to Claim 9, wherein the prompt is a modal prompt to provide a user with an activation choice.

11. (Original) A method according to Claim 9, wherein the prompt is a modeless prompt to advise a user of the object being suppressed.

12. (Previously Presented) A method according to Claim 9, wherein the prompt is a modeless prompt to advise a user of the object being suppressed and to provide the user with ~~an~~ a subsequent activation choice.

13. (Original) A method according to Claim 1,  
wherein assessing which of the plural trust levels is to be accorded to the object determines whether the object is a popup window, and

Type of Response: Amendment  
Application Number: 10/780,144  
Attorney Docket Number: 307917.01  
Filing Date: 17 February 2004

wherein further suppressing the object includes displaying a prompt to indicate the suppression of the object based upon a positive determination.

14. (Original) A method according to Claim 13, wherein the prompt is a modeless prompt to advise a user of the object being suppressed.

15. (Original) A method according to Claim 13, wherein the prompt is a modeless prompt to advise a user of the object being suppressed and to provide the user with an activation choice.

16. (Original) A method according to Claim 1,  
wherein assessing which of the plural trust levels is to be accorded to the object evaluates criteria including whether the object is beneath a security setting and whether a security setting flag is set, and  
wherein further suppressing the object includes displaying a prompt to indicate the suppression of the object based upon a positive evaluation of any of the criteria.

17. (Original) A method according to Claim 16, wherein the prompt is a modal prompt to provide a user with an activation choice.

18. (Original) A method according to Claim 16, wherein the prompt is a modeless prompt to advise a user of the object being suppressed.

Type of Response: Amendment  
Application Number: 10/780,144  
Attorney Docket Number: 307917.01  
Filing Date: 17 February 2004

19. (Original) A method according to Claim 16, wherein the prompt is a modeless prompt to advise a user of the object being suppressed and to provide the user with an activation choice.

20. (Original) A method according to Claim 1, wherein suppressing the object includes displaying a user interface to describe the content of the suppressed object and to provide a user with an opportunity to activate the content of the suppressed object.

21. (Currently Amended) A computer-readable storage medium having one or more instructions that, when read, cause one or more processors on a client device to execute steps comprising:

determine, at the client device, a trust level for an object associated with a web page to be displayed at the client device, the object not having a downloadable security profile, generated by an external content inspection engine, attached thereto;

suppress an action associated with the object based on the trust level without using the downloadable security profile or generating the downloadable security profile at the client device; and

provide an activation opportunity for the action,

wherein the trust level to be accorded to the object evaluates criteria, as a part of displaying the web page, based on a content, source, or action of the object and

wherein the activation opportunity comprises a user interface that displays a modeless prompt which provides a description of the object being suppressed.

Type of Response: Amendment  
Application Number: 10/780,144  
Attorney Docket Number: 307917.01  
Filing Date: 17 February 2004

22. (Previously Presented) A computer-readable storage medium according to Claim 21, wherein the object is one of a COM object or an ActiveX control.

23. (Previously Presented) A computer-readable storage medium according to Claim 21, wherein the object is embedded in the web page, and includes any one of a downloadable file, a link to another file, a popup window, graphic data, a video file, an audio file, and a text file.

24. (Previously Presented) A computer-readable storage medium according to Claim 21, wherein the object is a link to an object on a remote server, wherein further the object on the remote server includes any one of a downloadable file, another web page, a popup window, graphic data, a video file, an audio file, and a text file.

25. (Previously Presented) A computer-readable storage medium according to Claim 21, wherein further the one or more instructions to provide the activation opportunity for the action causes the one or more processors to display a user interface indicating the suppression of the action due to a positive evaluation of any of the criteria and offering an activation option.

26. (Previously Presented) A computer-readable storage medium according to Claim 25, wherein the user interface is a modal prompt.

27. (Canceled).

Type of Response: Amendment  
Application Number: 10/780,144  
Attorney Docket Number: 307917.01  
Filing Date: 17 February 2004

28. (Previously Presented) A computer-readable storage medium according to Claim 21,

wherein the one or more instructions to determine the trust level for the object causes the one or more processors to evaluate criteria including whether the object is to be rendered and whether a download flag is set, and

wherein further the one or more instructions to provide an activation opportunity for the action causes the one or more processors to display a user interface indicating the suppression of the action due to a positive evaluation of any of the criteria and offering an activation option.

29. (Previously Presented) A computer-readable storage medium according to Claim 28, wherein the user interface is a modal prompt.

30. (Canceled) .

31. (Previously Presented) A computer-readable storage medium according to Claim 21,

wherein the one or more instructions to determine the trust level for the object causes the one or more processors to determine whether the object is a popup window, and

wherein further the one or more instructions to provide an activation opportunity for the action causes the one or more processors to display a user interface indicating the suppression of the action due to a positive determination and offering an activation option.

32. (Canceled).

Type of Response: Amendment  
Application Number: 10/780,144  
Attorney Docket Number: 307917.01  
Filing Date: 17 February 2004

33. (Previously Presented) A computer-readable storage medium according to Claim 21, wherein the one or more instructions to determine the trust level for the object causes the one or more processors to evaluate criteria including whether the object is beneath a security setting and whether a security setting flag is set, and

wherein further the one or more instructions to provide an activation opportunity for the action causes the one or more processors to display a user interface indicating the suppression of the action due to a positive evaluation of either of the criteria and offering an activation option.

34-35. (Canceled).

36. (Currently Amended) An apparatus, comprising:

a detector to detect an object associated with a web page as a part of displaying the web page at a client device, wherein the object is not associated with a downloadable security profile, generated by an external content inspection engine, associated therewith;

an analyzer on the client device configured to perform a trust analysis for the object without using the downloadable security profile or generating the downloadable security profile at the client device;

a blocker to block an action associated with the object; and

an interface to provide an activation opportunity,

wherein the analyzer performs the trust analysis for the object using evaluation criteria, as part of displaying the web page, based on a source, content, or action of the object.

Type of Response: Amendment  
Application Number: 10/780,144  
Attorney Docket Number: 307917.01  
Filing Date: 17 February 2004



37. (Original) An apparatus according to Claim 36, wherein the object is one of a COM object or an ActiveX control.

38. (Original) An apparatus according to Claim 36, wherein the object is embedded in the web page, and includes any one of downloadable code, a link to a URL, a popup window, graphic data, a video file, an audio file, and a text file.

39. (Original) An apparatus according to Claim 36, wherein the object is a link to an object on a remote server, wherein further the object on the remote server includes any one of downloadable code, a URL, a popup window, graphic data, a video file, an audio file, and a text file.

40. (Previously Presented) An apparatus according to Claim 36, wherein further the blocker is to display a prompt indicating that the action has been blocked based upon a positive evaluation of any of the criteria.

41. (Original) An apparatus according to Claim 40, wherein the prompt is a modal user interface to provide a user with an activation choice.

42. (Previously Presented) An apparatus according to Claim 40, wherein the prompt is a modeless user interface to advise a user of the action being blocked and provide a description of the object.

Type of Response: Amendment  
Application Number: 10/780,144  
Attorney Docket Number: 307917.01  
Filing Date: 17 February 2004

43. (Previously Presented) An apparatus according to Claim 40, wherein the prompt is a modeless user interface to advise a user of the action being blocked and to provide the user with a subsequent activation choice.

44. (Original) An apparatus according to Claim 36,  
wherein the analyzer is to evaluate criteria including whether the object is to be rendered and whether a download flag is set, and  
wherein further the blocker is to display a prompt indicating that the action has been blocked based upon a positive evaluation of any of the criteria.

45. (Original) An apparatus according to Claim 44, wherein the prompt is a modal user interface to provide a user with an activation choice.

46. (Original) An apparatus according to Claim 44, wherein the prompt is a modeless user interface to advise a user of the action being blocked.

47. (Original) An apparatus according to Claim 44, wherein the prompt is a modeless user interface to advise a user of the action being blocked and to provide the user with an activation choice.

48. (Original) An apparatus according to Claim 36,  
wherein the analyzer is to determine whether the object is a popup window, and  
wherein further the blocker is to display a prompt indicating that the action has been blocked based upon a positive determination.

Type of Response: Amendment  
Application Number: 10/780,144  
Attorney Docket Number: 307917.01  
Filing Date: 17 February 2004

49. (Original) An apparatus according to Claim 48, wherein the prompt is a modeless user interface to advise a user of the action being blocked.

50. (Original) An apparatus according to Claim 48, wherein the prompt is a modeless user interface to advise a user of the action being blocked and to provide the user with an activation choice.

51. (Original) An apparatus according to Claim 36,  
wherein the analyzer is to evaluate criteria including whether the object is beneath a security setting and whether a security setting flag is set, and  
wherein further the blocker is to display a prompt indicating that the action has been blocked based upon a positive evaluation of any of the criteria.

52. (Original) An apparatus according to Claim 51, wherein the prompt is a modal user interface to provide a user with an activation choice.

53. (Original) An apparatus according to Claim 51, wherein the prompt is a modeless user interface to advise a user of the action being blocked.

54. (Original) An apparatus according to Claim 51, wherein the prompt is a modeless user interface to advise a user of the action being blocked and to provide the user with an activation choice.

Type of Response: Amendment  
Application Number: 10/780,144  
Attorney Docket Number: 307917.01  
Filing Date: 17 February 2004

55. (Original) An apparatus according to Claim 36, wherein the blocker is to display a user interface to describe the content of the suppressed action and to provide a user with an opportunity to activate the action of the object.

56. (Currently Amended) An apparatus for displaying a web page at a client device, comprising:

means for detecting an object associated with the web page at the client device;, the object not being associated with a downloadable security profile, generated by an external content inspection engine;

means for performing a trust analysis, at the client device, for the object as a part of displaying the web page, wherein the trust analysis is performed without using the downloadable security profile, or generating at the client device the downloadable security profile;

means for blocking an action associated with the object; and

means for providing an activation opportunity,

wherein the means for performing the trust analysis for the object evaluates criteria, as a part of displaying the web page, based on the content, source, or action of the object.

57. (Cancelled).

58. (Previously Presented) An apparatus according to Claim 56, wherein the object is a computer-readable media object.

Type of Response: Amendment  
Application Number: 10/780,144  
Attorney Docket Number: 307917.01  
Filing Date: 17 February 2004

59. (Original) An apparatus according to Claim 56, wherein the object is one of a COM object or an ActiveX control.

60. (Original) An apparatus according to Claim 56, wherein the object is embedded in the web page, and includes any one of downloadable code, a link to a URL, a popup window, graphic data, a video file, an audio file, and a text file.

61. (Original) An apparatus according to Claim 56, wherein the object is a link to an object on a remote server, wherein further the object on the remote server includes any one of downloadable code, a URL, a popup window, graphic data, a video file, an audio file, and a text file.

62. (Previously Presented) An apparatus according to Claim 56,  
wherein further the means for blocking is to display a prompt indicating that the action has been blocked based upon a positive evaluation of any of the criteria.

63. (Original) An apparatus according to Claim 56,  
wherein the means for performing a trust analysis is to evaluate criteria including whether the object is to be rendered and whether a download flag is set, and  
wherein further the means for blocking is to display a prompt indicating that the action has been blocked based upon a positive evaluation of any of the criteria.

64. (Original) An apparatus according to Claim 56,

Type of Response: Amendment  
Application Number: 10/780,144  
Attorney Docket Number: 307917.01  
Filing Date: 17 February 2004

wherein the means for performing a trust analysis is to determine whether the object is a popup window, and

wherein further the means for blocking is to display a prompt indicating that the action has been blocked based upon a positive determination.

65. (Original) An apparatus according to Claim 56,  
wherein the means for performing a trust analysis is to evaluate criteria including whether the object is beneath a security setting and whether a security setting flag is set, and  
wherein further the means for blocking is to display a prompt indicating that the action has been blocked based upon a positive evaluation of any of the criteria.

66. (Original) An apparatus according to Claim 56, wherein the means for blocking is to display a user interface to describe the content of the suppressed action and to provide a user with an opportunity to activate the action of the object.

Type of Response: Amendment  
Application Number: 10/780,144  
Attorney Docket Number: 307917.01  
Filing Date: 17 February 2004